

**IN THE DRAWING:**

Applicants respectfully request confirmation of the acceptance of the annotated drawings and instructions from the Examiner whether or not replacement sheets shall be required.

**REMARKS**

The applicants appreciate the consideration provided by Examiner Chu in the present matter.

Claims 1-29 are in the application.

Claims 1-29 stand allowed but for minor formal matters addressed herein.

Claim 3 has been withdrawn by Examiner action.

Claims 10, and 27 are amended.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the enclosed amendments and the following representations. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments is found in the original claims, specification, and drawings.

As this is the first opportunity Applicants have had to respond to the material issues at hand, they respond in detail to the items below and note additional matters requesting confirmation.

**1. Information Disclosure Statement**

On August 18, 2003 Applicants noted the submission of the corresponding German-case office action and the citation of two complete German references having English-language US patent counter parts; namely, US 5,967,858 to Yamada for a "Power Module" and US 5,825,085 to Masumoto et al. for a "Power Semiconductor Device". A copy of the DE examination Report and Decision to Grant with translations were provided at that time along with complete copies of the DE references with citation of the US counter part references for use as an abstract translation under §609A(3). It is noted that neither US counter-part reference is indicated in the PTO-892 form appended to the instant action.

While Applicants have fully and timely complied with the requirements under §609 should the Examiner recommend submission of the above-noted counter-part US references (parallel to the German references) they will be submitted upon such recommendation. A request is made to enter notice of the same on the face of any issued patent herefrom.

## **2. Drawings**

At present, the PTOL-326 does not indicate the acceptance status of the Annotated Sheet drawings of Figs. 1 or 3. Should such proposed annotated sheets be acceptable (as is believed to be the case here), Applicants will timely submit the same following as replacement sheets such confirmation. As the instant action requires no immediate replacement this may be easily arranged upon receipt of the Notice of Allowability. No submission is made at this time as no requirement has been made.

Applicants request the Examiner's instructions regarding the above.

## **3. Discussion regarding Claims 3, 10, 12, 22, and 27**

Comments are provided regarding the Examiner's comments to claims 3 and 22 on page 2 of the instant action. Applicants agree that claim 3 merely clarifies the limitations in claim 1; however claim 22 provides additional dependent limitations from claim 21; regarding placement, arrangement, and insulation status of the noted components. As a result Applicants have left claim 22 in place – additionally, as claim 22 requires all the limitations of an allowable generic linking claim (Claim 21) it is respectfully proposed as allowable for that reason as well as for the withdrawal of the restriction to all the claims (1-29) in general.

Comments are provided regarding claims 10, 12, and 27 on page 3 of the instant action.

Each is addressed in further detail below.

Regarding the Examiner's comments on page 3 involving claim 10 line 4, the Examiner suggests that we should insert the phrase --said at least two mutually insulating ribbon connectors--. Because the limitation should be "consistent with other claims."

Upon reviewing the support found within claim 1, which does not require an insulation layer to connect with both ribbon connectors, merely the existence of at least two, an alternative amendment is provided. It is respectfully proposed that the above clarification achieves the goal recommended by the Examiner - namely noting that the assembly contains at least two mutually insulated ribbon connectors - without limiting the claim beyond the presently allowable scope. As presently suggested by the Examiner, the insulation must exist between one DC port conductor and BOTH at least two insulated ribbon connectors – and this is not the arrangement supported in Fig. 2 where one DC port conductor is insulated from one ribbon connector by an insulation layer and one DC port conductor is not. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Examiner's comments on page 3 regarding claim 12, line 4 and the possible lack of antecedent basis for the "base element" in claim 1, Applicants respectfully respond as follows. Full support for the phrase "said at least one base element" is supported by line 2 of claim 12 where the phrase is initially introduced as "at least one base element". Reconsideration and removal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Examiner's comments on page 3 regarding claim 23, lines 2 and 3 suggesting the insertion of "DC Port Conductors" (plural), Applicants respectfully respond as follows. While the claims include two DC port conductors the proposed amendment would require a structural limitation; namely placing an insulation between both DC port conductors

and the at least one ribbon connector, and this is not required. As is respectfully noted in Fig. 2, while an embodiment may have two DC port conductors, an insulating layer may exist between only one DC port conductor and a ribbon connector. Reconsideration and removal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 10-0100. No new matter has been added.

In the spirit of condensed and streamlined practice, if the Examiner would like to discuss the present application, claims, amendments or other matters, Applicant would respectfully request a courtesy call to discuss placing the application in condition for allowance.

Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Andrew F. Young, Esq.  
Registration No. 44,001  
Attorney for Applicant

Lackenbach Siegel, LLP  
One Chase Road  
Scarsdale, NY 10583  
Date: November 27, 2006  
MERTE.Y3-6.Responsive Amendment.doc